

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-5 and 8-21 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 11 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 11-13, and 18 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 and 8-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,808,617 to Kenworthy *et al.* (hereinafter "Kenworthy") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,200 B1 to Bowen *et al.* (hereinafter "Bowen"). (See Office Action at p. 3.) Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended independent claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

A method for minimizing an amount of data needed to test a geometry chunk in a frame against subarea boundaries in a compositing window, comprising the steps of:

defining the geometry chunk with a bounding region, wherein said bounding region defines a space the geometry chunk occupies on the compositing window;

storing *data that defines said bounding region* for use in processing the geometry chunk in a subsequent frame;

sending said *data that defines said bounding region* to graphics pipelines;

determining, from said *data that defines said bounding region*, a graphics pipeline of said graphics pipelines that will render the geometry chunk;

assigning a subarea in the compositing window to receive an output of said graphics pipeline; and

communicating *data associated with the geometry chunk* to said graphics pipeline;

wherein said graphics pipelines are configured to render the frame by spatial compositing through parallel processing, said *data that defines said bounding region* is less than said *data associated with the geometry chunk*, and *the geometry chunk is different from said subarea*.

Independent claim 11 has been amended in a similar manner. These features are supported throughout the specification of the present patent application and particularly at paragraph 0057.

Neither Kenworthy nor Bowen, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests defining a geometry chunk with a bounding region; sending data that defines the bounding region to graphics pipelines; determining, from the *data that defines the bounding region*, a graphics pipeline that will render the geometry chunk; and communicating *data associated with the geometry chunk* to the graphics pipeline, wherein the data that defines the bounding region is less than the data associated with the geometry chunk.

Furthermore, in each of independent claims 1 and 11, *the geometry chunk is different from the subarea*. Applicants draw the attention of the Examiner to these features in light of the explanation of the rejection of claim 1 at pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action:

In regards to claim 1, Kenworthy teaches *a method for minimizing an amount of data needed to test a geometry chunk in a frame against subarea boundaries in a compositing window, comprising the steps of:*

- *defining the geometry chunk with a bounding region, wherein said bounding region defines a space the geometry chunk occupies on the compositing window;*

A scene, or portions of a scene, can be divided into pixel regions (e.g. 32x32 pixels), called chunks. The geometry is presorted into bins

based on which chunk the geometry the geometry will be rendered into [col. 8, lines 32-39].

- *assigning a subarea in the compositing window to receive an output of said graphics pipeline; and*
A scene, or portions of a scene, can be divided into pixel regions (e.g. 32x32 pixels), called chunks [col. 8, lines 32-39].

It appears that the Examiner is interpreting "[a] scene, or portions of a scene, can be divided into pixel regions" as teaching *both* a geometry chunk and a subarea of a compositing window.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Kenworthy in view of Bowen. Because each of claims 2-5, 8-10, and 12-21 depends upon claims 1 or 11 and because of the individual distinctive features of each of claims 2-5, 8-10, and 12-21, these claims are also patentable over Kenworthy in view of Bowen.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider claims 1-5 and 8-21, remove the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and pass these claims to allowance.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Timothy A. Doyle
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 51,262

Date: 24 Jul 07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600